

REMARKS

The Examiner is thanked for the thorough examination and search of the subject patent application.

Claims 44, 48, 49 and 60-68 are pending; Claim 44 has been currently amended; Claims 61-68 have been newly added; Claims 1-43, 45-47 and 50-59 have been canceled. No new matter is believed to have been added.

Response to Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections for at least the reasons set forth below.

Response to Claims 44, 48, 49 and 60

As currently amended, independent claim 44 is recited below:

44. A circuit component comprising:

a substrate;

a semiconductor chip over a top surface of said substrate, wherein said semiconductor chip has a front surface facing said top surface of said substrate and a back surface opposite to said front surface, wherein said semiconductor chip comprises multiple pads at said front surface;

an identity of product directly on said back surface of said semiconductor chip;

multiple metal bumps between said multiple pads of said semiconductor chip and said top surface of said substrate; and

an optically transparent layer directly over said identity of product, wherein said identity of product is visible through said optically transparent layer.

Section I:

Reconsiderations of Claims 44, 48, 49 and 60 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hikita et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,476,499) in view of Hiromasa (JP362169448) and of Claims 48, 49 and 60 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hikita et al. in view of Hiromasa, further in view of Flip Chip, are requested in accordance with the following remarks.

Applicants respectfully assert that the chip package claimed in Claim 44 patentably distinguishes over the citations by Hikita et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,476,499) in view of Hiromasa (JP362169448).

The Examiner considers that “At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Hikita et al. with those of Hiromasa in order to apply the teachings of transparent protective coatings over identification information”. ~See lines 1-3 on page 4, in the last Office Action mailed Apr. 29, 2008~

Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner’s opinion since the claimed subject matters cannot be attained even under Hikita et al.’s teaching in view of Hiromasa’s teaching. Under Hikita et al.’s teaching in view of Hiromasa’s teaching, one skilled in the art could form Hiromasa’s package material 2 over Hikita et al.’s chip 2, and then put an identity of product and manufacturer or a bar code covered with Hiromasa’s transparent resin 4 in Hiromasa’s recessed portion 3 in Hiromasa’s package material 2. In this case, Hikita et al.’s identity of product and

manufacturer or Hikita et al.'s bar code shown in Fig. 16A directly on a back surface 24 of Hikita et al.'s chip is covered with Hiromasa's package material 2, and is not believed to be visible through Hiromasa's package material 2 because Hiromasa's package material 2 is not suggested to be optically transparent. In consequence, the claimed subject matter that "an identity of product directly on a back surface of a semiconductor chip is visible through an optically transparent layer over the identity of product", as currently claimed in Claim 44 is believed to be unobvious over Hikita et al.'s teaching in view of Hiromasa's teaching.

Withdrawal of rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) to Claim 44 is respectfully requested.

Applicants respectfully submit independent Claim 44 patentably distinguishes over the prior art references, and should be allowed. For at least the same reasons, dependent Claims 48, 49 and 60 patentably define over the prior art as well.

Section II:

Reconsiderations of Claims 44, 48, 49 and 60 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hyozo et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,894,172) in view of Hiromasa (JP362169448) and Flip Chip are requested in accordance with the following remarks.

Applicants respectfully assert that the chip package claimed in Claim 44 patentably distinguishes over the citations by Hyozo et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,894,172) in view of Hiromasa (JP362169448) and Flip Chip.

The Examiner considers that “At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Hyozo et al./Flip Chip with those of Hiromasa in order to apply the teachings of transparent protective coatings over identification information”. ~ *See lines 11-13 on page 6, in the last Office Action mailed Apr. 29, 2008~*

Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner’s opinion since the claimed subject matters cannot be attained even under Hyozo et al.’s teaching in view of Hiromasa’s teaching and flip-chip technology. Under Hyozo et al.’s teaching in view of Hiromasa’s teaching and flip-chip technology, one skilled in the art could form Hiromasa’s package material 2 over a back surface of a flip chip, and then put an identity of product and manufacturer or a bar code covered with Hiromasa’s transparent resin 4 in Hiromasa’s recessed portion 3 in Hiromasa’s package material 2. If Hyozo et al.’s identity of product and manufacturer or Hyozo et al.’s bar code is formed directly on a back surface of a flip chip, it would be covered with Hiromasa’s package material 2. Hyozo et al.’s identity of product and manufacturer or Hyozo et al.’s bar code is not believed to be visible through Hiromasa’s package material 2 because Hiromasa’s package material 2 is not suggested to be optically transparent. In consequence, the claimed subject matter that “an identity of product directly on a back surface of a semiconductor chip is visible through an optically transparent layer over the identity of product”, as currently claimed in Claim 44 is believed to be unobvious over Hyozo et al.’s teaching in view of Hiromasa’s teaching and flip-chip technology.

Withdrawal of rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) to Claim 44 is respectfully requested.

Applicants respectfully submit independent Claim 44 patentably distinguishes over the prior art references, and should be allowed. For at least the same reasons, dependent Claims 48, 49 and 60 patentably define over the prior art as well.

For at least the same reasons, new Claims 61-68 patentably define over the prior art as well.

CONCLUSION

Some or all of the pending claims are believed to be in condition for allowance. Accordingly, allowance of the claims and the application as a whole are respectfully requested.

It is requested that should Examiner Walsh not find that the Claims are now Allowable that he call the undersigned at 845 452-5863 to overcome any problems preventing allowance.

Respectfully submitted,



Stephen B. Ackerman, Reg. No. 37,761